

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:	)	Confirmation No.: 1705
	)	
Pietro MARCOLIN	)	Art Unit: 3754
	)	
Appln. No.: 10/802,057	)	Examiner: P. F. Brinson
	)	
Filing Date: March 17, 2004	)	August 1, 2007
	)	
For: TUBE FOR CONVEYING FLUIDS	)	ATTY.'S DOCKET: MARCOLIN=1
AND METHOD...	)	

**REPLY TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Amendment  
Honorable Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

The applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed July 3, 2007, in the nature of a restriction requirement. The PTO has required restriction between what is said to be two (2) patentably distinct inventions.

As applicant must make an election even if the requirement were to be traversed, applicant hereby respectfully and provisionally elects Group I, directed to a tube for conveying fluids, presently claims 1-16, without traverse and without prejudice. Applicant accepts and relies on the PTO holding that the two inventions are patentably distinct from one another, i.e. each defines non-obvious subject matter over the other.

Appln. No. 10/802,057  
Amd. dated August 1, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 3, 2007

Nevertheless, as applicant believes that a complete search of the elected Group I subject matter would also require a search of the method for producing tubes in Class 264, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner exercise his discretion and examine both groups.

Applicant now respectfully awaits the results of a first examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By /SN/  
Sheridan Neimark  
Registration No. 20,520

SN:jec  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\B\bugv\MARCOLIN1\PTO\2007-08-01ReplyRestrReq.doc